DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 476 HE 021 404

AUTHOR Rees, Mary Anne
TITLE Music Faculty and the Achievement of Status in the University Environment.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the College Music Society (29th, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *College Faculty; Higher Education; Musical Composition; Music Education; *Music Teachers; Music Theory; *Professional Recognition; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Promotion

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to determine the ways in which various factors help in the achievement of status for the three types of music faculty (performance, theory and history, and music education). A questionnaire was sent to 207 full-time music faculty members in six state-supported university schools/departments of music. A response rate of 54.6% was obtained. Questionnaire items dealt with academic rank, the education of a faculty member, performance or compositional reputation, scholarly reputation, and the ability to teach and attract students. Results included the following: (1) performers in the music school believed that status is best achieved by one's performance ability, scholarly reputation, the ability to attract students, having a number of successful students, and by a performance reputation; (2) theorists-historians in the music school believed that having a number of commissions to compose original works, an ability to attract students, one's academic rank, performance reputation, and having one's performances reviewed by prominent critics help most to achieve status; and (3) music educators in universities believed that research, scholarly reputation, an ability to attract grant money, number of publications, serving on editorial boards, and academic rank helped most to achieve status. 6 references. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294476

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Anne Rees
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Music Faculty and the Achievement of Status in the University Environment

by

Mary Anne Rees
Ithaca College

In his well-known sociological study of the academic profession, Logan Wilson defined faculty in higher education as a heterogeneous lot of individuals who are engaged in diverse duties, but who have a common focus as employees of the university and as members of that broad occupational grouping known in our society as the professions (Wilson 1942). Wilson's broad occupational grouping includes such professions as doctors, dentists, lawyers, and architects in addition to university professors. Persons engaged in these occupations are usually considered to be professionals because they have an expertise in a limited area that has been gained through an extensive and specialized education. They tend to expect and have a high degree of autonomy. In addition, these professionals desire and expect a high degree of status or prestige from their occupation. This status or prestige is achieved through the recognition of two different reference groups in the academic profession - a faculty member's professional peers and a faculty member's colleagues on campus. Obviously, one's professional peers are specialists in the same area of expertise, while one's colleagues on campus are experts in numerous other disciplines.

Those considering a college or university teaching career should know that high status has been shown to be a strong factor in the academic career choice. It has also been found to be a prominent motivational characteristic in

HE 021 404

the teaching profession at the higher educational level (Wilson 1942). In an academic community, status is achieved primarily through professional activity such as research or musical performance. As university faculty are experts in a variety of discreet academic disciplines, the quality of this professional activity tends to be judged by one's professional peers (Wilson 1979). Further, these judgments are often made in locations a great distance away from the faculty member's campus. Therefore, a faculty member's status among fellow professionals might be more important than the status gained on his or her own campus. For example, the status of music theorists is largely determined by the judgments of other music theorists, and not by their students, their colleagues in other disciplines, the campus administration, or the general public (Wilson 1979).

In addition to professional peer recognition, a faculty member can also achieve status through the campus promotion and tenure system. Rewards such as salary, tenure or a promotion are particularly critical to faculty today. Unfortunately, declining budgets and enrollments dictate that many universities reduce their staffs and programs. Hence, salary increments, promotions to higher ranks and salary levels, and tenure are not as easily earned as they once were. In the achieving of status, however, promotion to a higher rank is especially desired and is often valued more than material rewards (Chait 1981). Therefore, university faculty can gain recognition through the status they achieve from their professional peers and from the institutional rewards they receive on their campus.

However, the variety of subjects taught on a university campus, the different teaching situations, as well as the different kinds of research supported and conducted can lead one to assume that not all university faculty

achieve the same degree of status. This idea is strongly supported by the research of Anthony Biglan (Biglan 1973a; Biglan 1973b). His study of faculty in various disciplines indicated that the characteristics and output of faculty do differ according to subject areas. With the differences among faculty in a school of music, Biglan's research suggests that music faculty might also differ according to the various disciplines or areas of expertise within the field of music.

A music faculty is traditionally divided into three areas of specialization: performance, theory and history, and music education. Faculty in these areas seemingly demonstrate their abilities in different ways, stress different curricula, and have different workloads. They also teach in different teacher-student situations. In addition, the education of music faculty members tends to be obtained in one of three different types of institutions: the conservatory, the research university and the "normal" school.

Because of these differences, music faculty predictably might have different degrees of status on the university campus. The purpose of this research is to determine how various factors help in the achievement of status for the three faculty types.

In gathering the data for this paper, a questionnaire was sent to 207 full-time music faculty members in six state-supported university schools/departments of music. Geographically, these schools span the entire United States. All schools offer degrees up to the doctoral level. Of the 207 questionnaires distributed, 113 usable responses were returned giving a response rate of 54.6%.

Table 1 presents the data on the items that achieve status in the

Table 1. Agreement Among Music Faculty of the Ability of Various Factors to Help in Achieving Status in the School of Music and the University Settings

Factors	School of Music Setting Mean by Faculty Type[1]			University Setting Mean by Faculty Type[1]		
	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education	Performance	Theory-History	Music Education
academic rank	4.0	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.6
the teacher with whom faculty member studied	3.0	3.2	3.0	2.5	2.3	2.5
being a graduate of a prestigious institution	3.6	3.9	3.5	3.7	4.2	3.6
performance ability	4.4	3.9	4.1	3.5	3.8	3.5
number of good reviews of performances and/or compositions	4.0	3.5	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.8
number of invitations to judge competitions	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.2	2.7	2.6**
having a regional or national performance reputation	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.4	4.2
number of off-campus performances	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.6
having performances/compositions reviewed by prominent critics	3.8	4.1	3.7	4.0	4.4	3.9
number of commissions to compose original works	3.8	4.4	4.2**	3.9	4.3	4.1
number of good reviews of publications	3.9	3.7	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.4
quality of publications	3.9	3.5	4.4**	3.9	4.0	4.5**
number of publications	4.0	3.9	4.5**	4.3	4.1	4.7**
ability to attract grant money	3.7	3.4	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.8*
being on editorial boards of prominent publications	3.6	3.3	4.4*	3.9	4.1	4.7*
having a regional or national scholarly reputation	4.4	3.9	4.6*	4.6	4.7	4.9
number of off-campus lectures	3.8	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.0
having scholarly works reviewed by prominent critics	3.7	3.5	4.1	3.9	4.4	4.2
number of successful students	4.3	3.7	4.1	3.5	3.6	3.5
being highly regarded by students	4.0	4.0	4.3	3.7	3.9	3.6
the ability to attract students	4.4	4.2	4.2	3.7	3.8	3.7

[1] Rating derived from Likert type scale from 1 to 5 signifying strongly disagree to strongly agree respectively.

* Response differences are at the .01 level of statistical significance.

** Response differences are at the .05 level of statistical significance.

school of music and university settings. The items relate to academic rank, the education of a faculty member, performance or compositional reputation, scholarly reputation, and the ability to teach and attract students. Respondents indicated, using a Likert scale (ranging from one to five signifying a strongly disagree to strongly agree respectively), whether they agreed or disagreed with each item's ability to help achieve status. Footnotes on the table indicate the response differences that are statistically significant.

Academic Rank

Academic rank was considered by all to be important in the achievement of status in both settings. In the school of music environment, the three faculty types gave this item an average rating of 4.0 or above (4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree). All three types believed academic rank was even more important in the university setting.

A faculty member's current rank might influence his or her perception of the ability of an academic rank to help achieve status. This did not appear to be the case, however, as a correlation of current rank held and how rank achieves status was not statistically significant.

Education

In order to determine how education affects status, the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate how the teacher with whom a faculty member studied and how being a graduate of a prestigious institution would aid in

status achievement. It was expected that the first item would be given a particularly high rating by the performance faculty. As the education of a performer is done primarily through individual instruction, it was believed that they would identify strongly with their performance teacher. Theory-history and music education faculty, who are schooled in traditional classroom situations, were expected to give higher ratings to the item referring to the institution.

As can be seen in the Table, all subjects were fairly neutral regarding the teacher with whom a faculty member studied and the university setting means are even lower indicating that respondents perceived that this item does not help in achieving status across campus.

Being a graduate of a prestigious institution is believed to help achieve status in the music school and particularly the university by the theory and history faculty. While the other two types of faculty also strongly believe that this item achieves status in both environments, they did not give it quite as high a rating. The groups were consistent in that they believe this item to be more important in the university setting.

Performance

Seven status achieving items related to performance were included in the questionnaire. As suggested by several sources (Caplow and McGee 1965; Wilson 1942; Wilson 1979), the items that are believed to best help achieve status are those that involve the judgments of an outside professional reference group. This appears to be the case with the items related to performance and their ability to achieve status. In particular, these items

include the regional or national reputation, the review of performances by prominent critics, and the number of commissions to compose original works.

As might be expected, the performance faculty gave the items related to performance high ratings. With one exception (number of invitations to judge competitions), all averages for both the music school and university settings are 3.5 or above. The performance faculty perceived that a regional or national reputation, performance ability as well as the number of good reviews were particularly valuable in achieving status in the music school. In the university setting, however, the ability to perform was not considered nearly as important. What was considered to be important with the university colleagues was being reviewed by prominent critics. These judgments by outsiders are apparently considered to be more important than one's actual ability to perform. Performers also considered the opinions of faculty outside the school of music to be important. The performance faculty believed that their performance reputation as well as the number of good performance reviews they receive are important across campus in achieving status.

The theory-history faculty also considered the judgments of an outside reference group to be most valuable in the achievement of status. This faculty type seemed to believe more strongly in this than the performance faculty in that they consistently gave high ratings to the reputation, being reviewed by prominent critics, and the number of commissions to compose original works. This held true for the school of music and university settings.

The music education faculty were somewhat unique in their perceptions of performance and its ability to achieve status. While they did give the various performance items high ratings, these ratings were not as high as the ratings given to the research items. The music education faculty were like the

theory-history faculty in that they believe judgments from an outside reference group are important in the achievement of status. In both the music school and university settings, high ratings were given to the reputation, being reviewed by prominent critics, and to the number of composition commissions. Further, they believed that the number of good reviews was more important to the university than to the school of music.

Research

Eight items were included in the questionnaire to examine the perceptions of the faculty on the ability of research to help in status achievement and several of these items helped distinguish among the three faculty types. Response differences proved to be statistically significant for those items related to the number and quality of publications, memberships on publications' editorial boards, scholarly reputation, and the ability to attract money.

The quality of publications as well as the number of publications are believed to help in status achievement in both the school of music and university environments. In the university setting, response means for the quality of publications are 3.9, 4.0, and 4.5 with the performance and music education faculty indicating the lowest and highest responses respectively. In the school of music, the performers believe that publication quality has the same ability to achieve status as in the university setting. Music educators also believe publication quality is valued in a similar fashion. The theory-history faculty, however, indicated a lower response for the ability of publication quality to achieve status in the school fo music setting.

The perceptions of the number of publications in achieving status also produced responses that differed significantly. Although the response means for this item are all high, the number of publications is more highly valued in the university setting.

Serving on editorial boards of prominent publications is also believed to achieve status in the school of music and university settings. As with the research items discussed above, the music education faculty gave the highest responses for this item for both settings.

Beliefs concerning the ability to attract grant money and achieved status produced statistically significant response differences for the university setting. As with the performance items, recognition from an outside reference group was considered to be very important in the achievement of status by all faculty. All faculty gave the regional or national scholarly reputation a very high rating in its ability to achieve status. Although the means for this item were high, they were different enough for the school of music environment to be statistically significant. The performers and music educators gave this item especially high ratings.

In this same vein, one might expect that having scholarly works reviewed by prominent critics would also help tremendously in achieving status. The theorists-historians believe that this item best achieves status in the university. Performers, however, believe that having scholarly works reviewed by prominent critics is not as important in the university setting as the number of publications, the ability to attract grant money, the scholarly reputation, or the number of off-campus lectures iven. Music educators also believe that other items better help achieve status in the university environment. These other items include the number and quality of publications,

the ability of attract grant money, serving on editorial boards of publications, and the scholarly reputation.

Association with Students

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they perceived different associations with students would help in the achievement of status. Items include how the number of successful students, how being highly regarded by students, and how the ability to attract students would help gain status.

The faculty do not strongly differentiate themselves in their responses to this section. All items are clearly perceived to be status achievers. The performers slightly distinguished themselves in that they give these three items very high ratings in the school of music setting. These findings agree with the opinion that performance faculty identify closely with their students. This perception, however, was not as strong in the university environment.

Summary

In the music school, performers believed that status is best achieved by one's performance ability, scholarly reputation, the ability to attract students, having a number of successful students, and by a performance reputation. Theorists-historians perceived that having a number of commissions to compose original works, an ability to attract students, one's academic rank, performance reputation as well as having one's performances reviewed by prominent critics help most to achieve status in the music school. Music

educators believe status was best achieved by one's scholarly reputation, the number and quality of publications, serving on editorial boards of prominent publications, and by one's academic rank.

In the university environment, status was best achieved by one's scholarly reputation, academic rank, the number of publications, an ability to attract grants, and having one's publications reviewed by prominent critics according to performers. The theory-history faculty believed one's scholarly reputation, having one's publications or performances reviewed by prominent critics, as well as one's performance reputation helped most in achieving status. Music educators believed strongly in the ability of research to achieve university status and indicated that the scholarly reputation, an ability to attract grant money, the number of publications, serving on editorial boards of publications, as well as one's academic rank helped most in achieving status.

Managing a university school of music is not an easy task. The results of this study provide valuable information on the three types of music faculty which can add to the insights and awareness of music and university administrators, and thus increase the effectiveness of an administration. These results also provide some valuable insights on the profession to high school music teachers and other musicians who may be considering a career in higher education. A knowledge of the importance of status to the profession could play an important role in their career decision.

NOTES

Anthony Biglan, "The Characteristics of Subject Matter in Different Acaemic Areas," Journal of Applied Psychology 57 (1973): 195-203;

_____, "Relationships Between Subject Matter Characteristics and the Structure and Output of University Departments," Journal of Applied Psychology 57 (1973): 204-213.

Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, The Academic Marketplace (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1965), p. 177.

Richard P. Chait, "Proposing a Framework for Faculty Development," Change 13 (1981): 32.

Logan Wilson, The Academic Man (London: Oxford University Press, 1942), p. 171.

_____, American Academics (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. 148.